



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/575,605

05/22/2000

Kornelis Antoine Schouhamer Immink

PHN-17.459

1475

24737

7590

11/23/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

KUMAR, PANKAJ

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2631

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/575,605

Applicant(s)

SCHOUHAMER IMMINK,  
KORNELIS ANTOINE

Examiner

Pankaj Kumar

Art Unit

2631

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: 3, 8 and 13.Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 15.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16-19.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

TESFALDET ZOCURE  
PRIMAR EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2631

Applicant argues that since Bauml does multiplication and applicant is not claiming multiplication, that Bauml does not meet the claim limitations. This is not persuasive since applicant does not claim that their claim excludes multiplication.

Applicant recites various sections from its specification in their argument to show that their invention is different than Bauml. Although the claims are read in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not incorporated into the claims.

Applicant argues that the mutually different digital words of the application are not the same as the  $P(1) \dots P(u)$  since the specification of the application indicates the use of augments and scrambler. This is not persuasive since augments and scrambler have not been claimed. Also, Bauml says in col. 4 line 50 that  $P$  is either  $+1$ ,  $-1$ ,  $+j$ , or  $-j$ . Thus, for example, if one  $P$  is  $+1$  and another  $P$  is  $-1$  or  $+j$  or  $-j$ , then one  $P$  is mutually different from another  $P$ .

Applicant argues that the  $P$ s of Bauml do not split into fragments that can be randomly mixed with the fragments of a dataword and hence the  $P$ s of Bauml are not mutually different digital words. This is not persuasive since the applicant has not claimed that mutually different digital word means that it must be split into fragments that can be randomly mixed with the fragments of a dataword.

Applicant argues that Bauml's  $au(1) \dots au(U)$  are not alternative digital sequences since Bauml uses multiplication to generate  $au(1) \dots au(U)$  and the applicant does not use multiplication. This is not persuasive since applicant does not claim that their claim excludes multiplication.